



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,566	07/11/2001	Keita Ito	010698	4812
38834	7590	11/17/2004	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			LUGO, CARLOS	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3676		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/901,566	ITO ET AL.
	Examiner Carlos Lugo	Art Unit 3676

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3 and 4.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on 13 November 2002 is a)  approved or b)  disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



DANIEL P. STODOLA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The combination of the seal structure in a crankcase, as described by Obermayer, and the seal design that Prior teaches, describe the invention as claimed in claims 1,3 and 4.

Obermayer indeed clearly discloses an enlarged recess provided in ONE of the first and second case halves. Obermayer discloses a cup recess, however, that recess is not an "U-shaped" groove that receive the bar shape seal member; is only a recess that receives a portion of the seal.

The claim language recites:

"the crankcase being comprised of first and second case halves...wherein only one of the joint surfaces of said first and second case halves includes a U-shaped seal groove extending along a peripheral edge of said crank chamber...a bar-shaped seal member mounted in said seal groove to come into close contact with the other of said joint surfaces of the first and second case halves such that enlarged end portions integrally formed at opposite ends of said bar-shaped seal member are entirely filled in the enlarged recesses".

Obermayer only discloses one U-shaped seal groove, not two U-shaped seal grooves.

Prior is only used to show that it is well known in the art to have a bar-shaped seal member of a simple design that is received in a groove between crankcases members having enlarged opposite ends that are received on enlarged recess at the end of the groove; and that between the enlarged end portions of the seal and the joint surfaces is placed a gasket.

Therefore, Obermayer, as modified by Prior, discloses the invention as claimed.